

MINUTES
UTAH
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY/AUDIOLOGY LICENSING BOARD
MEETING

October 17, 2007

Room 475 - 4th Floor – 9:00 a.m.
Heber Wells Building
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

CONVENED: 9:04 a.m.

ADJOURNED: 10:15 a.m.

Bureau Manager:

Clyde Ormond

Board Secretary:

Jacky Adams

Board Members Present:

Walter Cox, Chairperson
Patricia Anderson
Bonnie Rice
Chad Bingham
Paige Canfield

Board Members Absent:

Guests:

Sheryl Spriet USHA (Utah Speech and Hearing Association) President

DOPL Staff Present:

F David Stanley

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS:
MINUTES:

Ms. Rice seconded by Ms. Anderson made a motion to approve the minutes from the July 18, 2007 meeting, the motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:
Proposed Rules Changes – R156-41-601

Mr. Ormond reminded the Board, that at the July 18, 2007 meeting, the Board discussed changing the requirements to become an “Audiology Aide” or a “Speech-language Pathology Aide”. Currently the minimum requirements are:
High School graduate or equivalent; and
Registered as a Health Care Assistant.
The Board had agreed to research other States requirements, and contact the associations, to determine the appropriate requirements and what action should be taken.

Mr. Bingham submitted ASHA’s (American Speech and Hearing Associations) guidelines for use of assistants

(aides). The guidelines indicated similar requirements, to Utah's, with the exception of education, which the information did not indicate.

Ms. Spriet indicated that the current DOE (Department of Education) requirements are inferior to the requirements of DOPL (Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing). She then explained that the DOE may be changing to require a BA (Bachelors of Arts) degree in Communicative Disorders, and the "aide" must be supervised for twenty five percent of the time by an ASHA certified supervisor.

Ms. Anderson explained that she felt that the Statute should be changed to increase the educational requirements and to better define an "aides" duties. Mr. Cox did not feel that this was the best course of action, explaining that there were very few "aids" who did not work for the DOE.

Mr. Ormond expressed that if this change is made that an individual with a BA degree may not be willing to work for eight to ten dollars an hour, adding that this could cause a hardship on this profession. Ms. Anderson agreed adding that in other States, similar professions make approximately thirty thousand per year. Mr. Bingham agreed also adding that the issue still needed to be resolved, due to while a student is completing their CFY (Clinical Fellowship Year), the scope of practice is less than a Hearing Instrument Specialist, and the individual has at minimum a Masters degree.

It was then determined that Ms. Spriet will discuss this issue at the next association meeting, later this month. She will report the associations, and the DOE's decisions at the January 16, 2008 Board meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE:

American Academy of Audiology
"Audioprosthologist"

– Mr. Ormond reviewed a letter which was received by the Division, on May 14, 2007, from the AAA (American Academy of Audiology). The letter indicated that AAA felt that the use of "Audioprosthologist" by a licensee who is not an Audiologist could significantly mislead consumers to believe that the licensee is an Audiologist. The letter further suggested that use of this term by anyone who is not a licensed Audiologist should be prohibited. Mr. Ormond then questioned the Board to determine if use of this term could be used by a licensed HIS (Hearing Instrument Specialist), if the licensee was properly trained.

Mr. Ormond explained that this issue was discussed at the last HIS Board, on October 10, 2007. The HIS Board

indicated that there are approximately eight licensees who use the title of “Audioprosthologist”, adding that each license has undergone an extensive training program, sponsored by the International Hearing Society. Mr. Ormond then added that both Florida and Arkansas currently allow licensed Hearing Instrument Specialist’s to use this title. This Board strongly disagreed with allowing a HIS to use this title, explaining that it could cause consumer confusion.

Mr. Stanley expressed a concern that the public needs to be able to easily distinguish between a Hearing Instrument Specialist and an Audiologist, adding that each profession needs to enact “Strong rules without any legal tinsel ornament”, the Board agreed.

After a detailed discussion Mr. Ormond will review this issue with Ms. Lenore Epstein and Mr. Karl Perry, Assistant Attorney General representatives.

NCSB – Quarterly News Letter

Reviewed, with no further action taken.

ADJOURN:

10:15 a.m.

Note: These minutes are not intended to be a verbatim transcript but are intended to record the significant features of the business conducted in this meeting. Discussed items are not necessarily shown in the chronological order they occurred.

January 16, 2008

(ss) Walter Cox

Date Approved

Chairperson, Utah Speech-Language Pathology/Audiology Licensing Board

January 16, 2008

(ss) Clyde Ormond

Date Approved

Bureau Manager, Division of Occupational & Professional Licensing